

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Docket Number (Optional)

32758US6

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the  
 United States Patent Service with sufficient postage as first class mail  
 in accordance with 37 CFR 1.53(b) and 37 CFR 1.53(c) for  
 electronic filing on 01-16-2007.

Signature /Robert F. Bodi/

Typed or printed name Robert F. Bodi

Application Number

10/662,707

Filed

09/15/2003

First Named Inventor

Masaki Terashima

Art Unit

3662

Examiner

Ian J. Lobo

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐

applicant/inventor.

/robertfbodi/

Signature

☐

assignee of record of the entire interest.

See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
 (Form PTO/SB/96)

Robert F. Bodi

Typed or printed name

☒

attorney or agent of record. 48540

Registration number

216/579-1700

Telephone number

☐

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34

January 16, 2007

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.

Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.

☒

\*Total of 1 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

## Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Masaki Terashima  
Appln. No. : 10/662,707  
Filed : September 15, 2003  
Title : ROAD ANTENNA CONTROLLED ON THE BASIS OF  
RECEIVING RATE  
  
Conf. No. : 1017  
TC/A.U. : 3662  
Examiner : Ian J. Lobo  
  
Customer No. : 000,116  
Docket No. : 32758US6

Mail Stop Appeal  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

These remarks are provided along with a Notice of Appeal and a Request for a Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Review. Claims 15, 16, 27, and 28 remain in this application. Claims 1-14 and 17-26 have been previously canceled.

Claims 15, 16, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner complains that claim 15 and claim 27 both recite “‘control means’ which ‘inhibits’ or ‘allows’, respectively, establishment of communication with the vehicle traveling in a predetermined direction.” Despite applicant amending the claims as suggested by the Examiner at the previously conducted personal interview, the Examiner maintains his rejections of these claims.

The Examiner argues that the specification and drawings do not provide an enabling disclosure of *how* the control section “‘inhibits’ or ‘allows’ such communications.” At the personal interview, applicant pointed out the teachings of the specification, and the Examiner requested that applicant point out where the specification

discusses such features in a formal response to the outstanding Office action, which the applicant did by noting that on page 46 of the specification, it is discussed that communications with a vehicle is “inhibited” depending on the direction of the vehicle. Furthermore, on pages 18-19 of the specification, it is discussed that communication is established with a vehicle traveling in the proper lane and/or direction, and that communication is inhibited if the vehicle is traveling in the improper lane and/or direction. Accordingly, the specification supports the language of the claim.

Nevertheless, the Examiner maintains that the specification does not disclose “HOW” the invention would inhibit or allow such communication. MPEP §2164.05 clearly states that enablement only requires disclosure sufficient to allow one “skilled in the art” to practice the invention. Applicant maintains that it is well within the skill in the art to practice such a feature, as the specific functions of inhibiting and establishing communications are generally known in the art. In particular, one skilled in the art could merely turn a transmitter/receiver on or off depending on whether the communication was allowed or inhibited (i.e., depending on the direction of travel). Thus, if communication is allowed (i.e., the vehicle is traveling in one direction), the apparatus could enable communication by allowing transmission to, and reception from, the vehicle. In contrast, if communication is not allowed (i.e., inhibited because the vehicle is traveling in another direction), the apparatus could just turn off the communications function. Furthermore, other implementations also exist, such as merely ignoring any incoming transmissions (by, for example, failing to respond or analyze a query signal) and refusing to transmit any return signals, or not transmitting a query if the vehicle expects such a query to establish communication. The mere function of establishing or inhibiting communication, standing alone, is not the novel aspect of the invention and is within the skill of the art. It is combining this feature with the additional claim limitations that provides the novelty of the invention, and makes the claims patentable over the prior art.

Accordingly, because practicing the feature of inhibiting communications is well within the means of one skilled in the art, there is no need to specifically recite “HOW” such a feature would be implemented in the specification. The Examiner’s demand for an explanation of “how” the device would inhibit or allow communications is like

requiring disclosure of how a signal might be “amplified” or “attenuated” in a transmitter. Such functions are well-known and are implemented in a variety of ways known to those skilled in the art, and thus specific implementations need not be explicitly explained for engineers skilled in the art to practice them. Similarly, the functions of “inhibiting” or “allowing” a communication to take place is also within the skills of such engineers. Accordingly, the Examiner should withdraw his rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and allow the claims because the claims are not rejected under any prior art.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32758US6.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:                     / Robert F. Bodi /  
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

1801 East Ninth Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: January 16, 2007